



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U5360/W/24/3356718

32-34 Castlewood Road, London N16 6DW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jack Silver against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hackney.
 - The application ref. is 2024/1810.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an additional storey with a rear roof extension and a Juliet balcony and the insertion of roof lights to the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The site comprises a pair of houses in the middle of a Victorian terrace, all in the same style, each pair stepped to climb the hill on which they are situated. Except for the end houses and the adjoining pair just uphill of the site, nos. 28 and 30, which are three-storey, each pair is two-storey with a basement and attic rooms.
4. The proposal would add a further storey to the pair with rear dormers. The street elevation would be in the same style, materials and fenestration pattern, the latter stepped down from nos. 28 and 30. However, instead of being similarly stepped down, the ridge and eaves would be level with those of nos. 28 and 30. Details of both the existing and any proposed string courses are omitted.
5. As a result, the distance between the upper floor windows and eaves would be disproportionate to those of neighbours and appear odd. The lack of articulation otherwise achieved by stepping down the ridge, eaves and string courses would tend also to increase massing and sense of bulk as read in combination with nos. 28 and 30 and interrupt the rhythm and proportions of the terrace. Opportunities to repair fenestration patterns to the rear appear not to have been taken.
6. The Stamford Hill Characterisation Study (2017) clearly categorises the street as 'Victorian Terrace', a typology the draft Stamford Hill Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (February 2024) identifies as suitable for additional matching floors. As basement heights and bays are consistent along the terrace, the Council's suggestion that the subject is closer in character to a 'Victorian Villa' on that basis must imply the same of the whole street, a finding which would seem

at odds with the Study. In any event, because the SPD is in draft form and the Study a part of its evidence base, I only attach limited weight to them.

7. The location alongside existing three-storey houses nonetheless suggests that an additional storey need not be incongruous or incompatible. The change from three- to two-storey between no. 30 and the site, whether original or not, would simply be moved down the terrace. However, I have found the detailed design of the proposal would fail to adequately effect that change by replicating the smaller step characteristic of the terrace and would therefore harm its character and appearance.
8. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policies D1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, which require, amongst other things, an understanding of character, including proportion and form, to achieve growth and high-quality design. It would also conflict with Policy LP1 of the Hackney Local Plan (2020) which requires design to respond to character and context, amongst other things.
9. Whilst the emerging Stamford Hill Area Action Plan (AAP) is at an advanced stage of preparation, I have no details of outstanding objections to its policies. Despite this, I note that its objectives include enabling extensions to address overcrowding, to which I attach moderate weight.

Other Matters

10. Whilst I note support amongst some neighbours for a building of the same design and height as nos. 28 and 30, I have found that the detailed design of the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building and terrace.
11. The proposal would include nesting bricks, enhancing biodiversity and complying with Policy G6 of the London Plan and Policies LP33 and LP47 of the Hackney Local Plan (2020). I attach moderate weight to this. It would also employ better-insulating materials, thereby addressing overheating, improving sustainability and complying with Policies LP54 and LP55 of the Hackney Local Plan (2020). As modest benefits required by the development plan, I assign only moderate weight to these factors weighing in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to the development plan as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the benefits of the proposal, which indicate planning permission should be granted in this case. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR